

REMARKS

Claims 78-99 have been cancelled and Claims 100-115 have been added. No claims have been amended. Therefore, claims 100-115 are pending in the application.

I. SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW

On June 23, 2008, Patent Agent, Deborah Caswell and Patent Attorney, Marcel Bingham met in a phone conference with Examiner, Leon Jonathan Harper to discuss Claims 78, 86, and 94, and to better understand where within Bridge and Thomson “determining a manner in which to transport the selected object” is described. The Examiner is thanked for granting a very productive interview. Applicants have a much better understanding of the interpretations accorded the cited art.

ISSUES RELATED TO THE PRIOR ART – SECTION 103 – BRIDGE and THOM

Claims 78 – 99 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US 5,890,167 (hereinafter Bridge) in view of US 2004/0034515 (hereinafter Thom). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 78-99

Claims 78-99 are cancelled in this application, rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 100

New independent Claim 100 recites in part,

“said source ETL application includes source ETL metadata, separate from said source database metadata, that describes database objects of said source database;

*said source ETL application **causing generation of a module** comprising
metadata that describes said one or more of database objects;
a target ETL application **reading said module**; ...
wherein said target ETL application includes target ETL metadata, separate from
said target database metadata, that describes said database objects of
said target database;
wherein said reading said module causes said target ETL application to perform
loading said database objects within said target database;
wherein said loading includes:
**modifying said target ETL metadata to describe said one or more
database objects**;
modifying said target database metadata to describe said one or more
database objects;
incorporate within said target database a tablespace holding data for at
least one of said one or more database objects.”*

Neither Bridge nor Thom describe, teach, or in any way suggest the quoted features. There is no mention anywhere of a source ETL application that exports its own metadata associated with database objects in the source database and a target ETL application that modifies its metadata based on the extracted source ETL application metadata. Even more, there is no mention anywhere that in conjunction with exporting its metadata to a target ETL application, that the ETL application exports metadata from a source database to a target database. As there is no suggestion in either Bridge or Thom regarding an ETL application with these features, no combination of Bridge and Thom would provide an ETL application with these features.

Applicant has found a distinguishing feature of Claim 100 not found in the combination of Bridge and Thom. Therefore, Claim 100 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Bridge and Thom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully submitted.

Claim 108

New independent Claim 108 recites in part,

“source external application includes source external application metadata, separate from said source database metadata, that describes said one or more database objects;
*said source external application causing **generation of a module** comprising metadata that describes said one or more database objects;*
a target external application reading said module; ...
wherein said target external application includes target external metadata, separate from said target database metadata, that describes said one or more database objects;
*wherein said reading said module causes said target external application to **perform loading** said one or more database objects within said target database and said target external application, wherein loading includes:*
modifying said target external metadata to describe said one or more database objects; and
modifying said target database metadata to describe said internal database object.

Claim 108 is very similar to Claim 100. As argued above for Claim 1, the combination of Bridge and Thom fails to teach an external application with metadata separate from the database metadata exported into a module, read by a target external application, and loaded into the target external application by modifying the target application metadata. Even more, there is no mention anywhere that in conjunction with exporting its metadata to a target external application, that the external application exports metadata from a source database to a target database.

Applicant has found a distinguishing feature of Claim 108 not found in the combination of Bridge and Thom. Therefore, Claim 108 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Bridge and Thom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully submitted.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependent claims that depend on an independent claim discussed above. Because each of the dependent claims includes the limitations of claims upon which it depends, each of the dependent claims is patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which each dependent claim depends is patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependent claims and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied.

Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: July 21, 2008

/Deborah L. Caswell#61766/
Deborah L. Caswell
Reg. No. 61,766

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 544
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone No.: (408) 754-1455
Facsimile No.: (408) 408-1076